



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,773	05/25/2001	Aruna Rohra Suda	4233-4002	5757
27123	7590	11/22/2004		
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.		EXAMINER		
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER		CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T		
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2164		

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/865,773	SUDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Srirama Channavajala	2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15, 18-57 and 59-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15, 18-57 and 59-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-15,18-57,59-93 are pending in this application.
2. Claims 16-17,58 are cancelled, see paper filed on 6/15/2004
3. Claims 80-93 have been added, see paper filed on 6/15/2004
4. In view of the applicant proper number form of the claims, the claim objections set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

Drawings

5. Examiner acknowledges applicant substituted drawings fig 6,10,24,35,31,32,34,35,37-41,85,89 acceptable for examination purpose, filed on 6/15/2004.

Priority

6. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application Serial No. 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601, filed in JAPAN on 5/29/2000, 7/7/2000,10/16/2000 respectively. Examiner acknowledges applicant submitted **certified copy** of the 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601 applications as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/25/2001, paper no. # 3; 4/11/2002, paper no. # 4; 12/8/2003, paper no. # 5; 8/28/2003, paper no. # 6 respectively acknowledged. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 is enclosed with this office action, paper no. # 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. ***Claims 1-8,13-15,18-20, 58-71,78-79,93, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319 in view of Danneels, US Patent No. 6038598***

9. As to Claims 1,59-60, 93, Ambroziak teaches a system which including 'data acquisition means for acquiring web page data' [see Abstract, col 2, line 38-39, col 6, line 4-7], Ambroziak is directed to intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer, more specifically using network browser, extracting information or data or document data or web data from the required document as detailed in Abstract, acquiring data corresponds to extracting information from the content of the document or web page;

'determination means for determining whether the acquired web page data satisfies the condition' [col 8, line 65-67, col 9, line 1-2, line 16-22], Ambroziak firstly, teaches user interface where user has the ability to select required buttons as detailed in fig 13, secondly, when user selects "GO TO URL" button that activates respective URL or phrase to browser element 210 to access identified server and retrieves the relevant information, therefore, as best understood by the examiner, data or information has already been saved, so that user can access identified server to retrieve specific information as detailed in col 8, line 65-67, col 9, line 1-2; It is further noted that browser guide element 100 help determine that satisfies the set condition(s) to match the user's requested web page that corresponds to acquired web page data satisfies the condition as detailed in col 9, line 16-22;

'indexing means for assigning a predetermined index to the web page data if the web page data is determined to satisfy the condition' [col 3, line 55-59, col 5, line 49-56, col 8, line 42-50], Ambroziak specifically teaches index server that maintains index as detailed in index server process, as detailed in fig 1, further Ambroziak specifically teaches user interface where querying index for example "on line " query as detailed in fig 13, col 8, line 42-50, that corresponds to web page data is determined to satisfy the condition;

'index dynamically assigned to the web page data' [col 3, line 21-28, col 5, line 24-29, col 7, line 2-8], Ambroziak teaches dynamically organizing information, more specifically dynamically organized in real-time during browsing, i.e., index controller controls the operations of browser guide element 10, and dynamically updates information;

'saving means for saving the requested web page data determined to satisfy the condition and the assigned index in a predetermined storage unit' [col 6, line 16-26, line 43-45], Ambroziak specifically teaches index server, and querying index, as best understood by the examiner, index server acts as storing indexed web page(s) or web data or documents, further Ambroziak also teaches querying index that corresponds to setting specific condition to retrieve corresponding urls from index element 140.

It is however, noted that Ambroziak does not specifically teach 'setting means for setting a condition for web page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data', although Ambroziak teaches acquiring web page data that satisfies the

condition(s) [see col 8, line 65-67, col 9, line 1-2, line 16-22]. On the other hand, Danneels disclosed 'setting means for setting a condition for web page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data' [see abstract, fig 1, col 4, line 19-22], Danneels specifically teaches setting specific condition(s) for web pages and web page and their associated conditions stored in memory element 17.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Danneels into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak because both Danneels and Ambroziak are directed to internet browsing, more specifically browsing internet to retrieve web document(s) or web page(s) [see Danneels: Abstract; Ambroziak: Abstract], and both Danneels and Ambroziak querying specific web page(s), displaying using user interface [see Danneels: fig 1; Ambroziak: fig 12-13] and both Danneels and Ambroziak are from same field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Danneels into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak because that would have allowed used of Ambroziak not only set specific condition for specific web page[s] but also allows to logical evaluation of the set conditions, further allowing to access dynamic web pages to a single uniform resource locator as suggested by Danneels [see col 1,

line 65-67, col 2, line 1-7], thus improving quality, reliability of browsing of dynamic world wide web pages.

10. As to Claim 2, Ambroziak teaches a system which including 'acquisition means acquires data from a browser client, said browser client allowing browsing of data in an Internet' [see fig 1-2col 5, line 24-29], browsing of data in an Internet corresponds to Ambroziak's fig 1-2.

11. As to Claim 3, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'predetermined storage is a database' [see fig 2], predetermined storage database corresponds to fig 2, element 150, 'system further comprising data retrieving means for retrieving data from the database based on a user-supplied index, said user-supplied index specified by a user' [fig 2, col 6, line 43-49].

12. As to Claim 4, 64, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'sorting means for sorting indices of the data in the storage unit' [col 8, line 56-58], sorting indices corresponds to query results ordered on ranked based because results of a query on index or URLs as detailed col 8, line 51-58; 'display means for displaying a result of the sorting by said sorting means' [col 8, line 51-53].

13. As to Claim 5, 65, 68, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 4 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'soring means performs the sorting based on a plurality of types of indices' [col 8, line 56-58, line 65-67, col 9, line 1-9], also see fig 1, element 140, 130; plurality of types of indices corresponds to fig 1, element 130,140.

14. As to Claim 6, 66, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 4, above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'selecting means for selecting an index from the indices displayed on said display means' [col 8, line 65-67, col 9, line 1-2]; 'retrieval means for retrieving data corresponding to the index selected by said selecting means from the database' [col 9, line 12-22].

15. As to Claim 7, 67, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 4, above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'deleting means for deleting at least one index from the indices displayed on said display means, removal means for removing data corresponding to the index deleted by said deleting means from the database' [col 9, line 66-67, col 10, line 1-6], as best understood by the examiner, Ambroziak specifically suggests various buttons such as browse, query, freeze, exclude and like in a graphical user environment [see fig 13], further, Ambroziak also suggests for example updating information, more specifically index server updating all active information affected by changes to index as detailed in col 9, line 66-67, col 10, line 1-6.

16. As to Claim 8, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 4, above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'sorting means places the plurality of values at positions corresponding to respective values' [col 8, line 56-58].

17. As to Claim 13, Ambroziak disclosed 'acquires URL of the data from the browser as the index' [col 6, line 43-49].

18. As to Claim 14, Ambroziak disclosed 'indexing means acquires at least one of a keyword or a title embedded in the data from the browser as the index' [col 6, line 43-45], keyword corresponds to query word or phrase.

19. As to Claim 15, Ambroziak disclosed 'each of the group corresponds to a session for the network' [col 1, line 21-26].

20. As to Claim 18, Ambroziak disclosed 'assigning a word specified by a user as a further index to the data to be saved' [col 9, line 24-29, line 53-56].

21. As to Claim 19-20, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1, above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'saving means saves the data as a new data or updates the other data according to a setting by the user' [col 9, line 66-67, col 10, line 1-6].

22. As to Claim 61, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'predetermined index is dynamically generated' [col 3, line 22-29, col 5, line 25-30].

23. As to Claim 62, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'predetermined storage unit is a database' [col 5, line 42-44].

24. As to Claim 63, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'retrieving data from said database based on a user-supplied index' [col 6, line 43-49].

25. As to Claim 69-70, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'sending the acquired data to a predetermined destination' [col 6, line 59-65].

26. As to Claim 71, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'data is acquired from a browser client, said browser client allowing browsing of data in an Internet' [see fig 1,3, col 7, line 16-20].

27. As to Claim 78, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'displays the keyword or the title acquired from the browser' [col 6, line 43-52].

28. As to Claim 79, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'node creation means for creating nodes corresponding to groups classified' [col 3, line 21-29, col 4, line 25-35], 'node creation means creates a hierarchical nodes by dividing a group corresponding to a period into a plurality of sub group each corresponding to a shorter period and creating a node corresponding to each of sub group' [col 4, line 1-18, line 45-55]; 'node displaying means for displaying a plurality of nodes created by said node creation means in an order of saving' [col 5, line 1-8,fig 13-14].

29. *Claims 9-12,72-74, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319, Danneels, US Patent No. 6038598, as applied to claims 1, 60 above, and further in view of Smith et al., [hereafter Smith], US Patent No.6578078*

30. As to Claim 9-10, 72-74, Ambroziak disclosed labels represent web page, document, file etc., [col 5, line 63-67]. Danneels also disclosed web page, document, file [see col 3, line 1-10, fig 1] It is however, noted that Ambroziak, Danneels do not specifically teach 'folder creation means for creating a new folder for newly browsed data', 'predetermined name to the newly browsed data', new folder with the assigned file name', although Danneels specific operating system WINDOWS NT does support creating files, folders and like [Danneels: col 3, line 50-54] On the other hand, Smith disclosed folder creation means for creating a new folder for newly browsed data', 'predetermined name to the newly browsed data', new folder with the assigned file name' [fig 9C, col 16, line 17-35]., Smith specifically teaches various folders and related files with specific folder and file names as detailed in fig 9c.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of smith et al., into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak, method of providing one of a plurality of web pages mapped to a single URL based on condition[s] of Danneels because Smith, Danneels and Ambroziak are directed to Browsing Internet, more

specifically Smith is directed to preserving integrity within the web sites, that including updating links to external web sites [see Abstract, fig 4], Ambroziak is directed to networking browser is used retrieving information or documents, analyzing the conceptual information, assembling index of the extracted information that reflects relations based on semantic data [see Abstract, col 2, line 38-45], Danneels directed to browsing internet to retrieve web document(s) or web page(s) that satisfy specific conditions [see Danneels: Abstract] and are from same field of endeavor.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to modify combination of Ambroziak, Danneels reference, more specifically incorporate Smith's file structure or meta data files consisting of root folder, sub folders, and files with respective folder and file names as detailed in fig 9c, col 16, line 17-30, also because that would have allowed uses of Ambroziak, Danneels to properly organize specific web pages or related information, thus improving quality and reliability of the system.

31. As to Claim 11, Smith disclosed 'folder name is a fixed name' [see fig 9c].

32. As to Claim 12, Smith disclosed 'file name generation means for generating a unique file name for the newly browsed data without intervention by a user' [col 11, line 23-38], unique file name corresponds to sub-folder element 334 containing HTML

document element 335; 'file saving means for saving the newly browsed data with adding the generated file name' [col 11, line 38-47].

33. Claims 21-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319, Danneels, US Patent No. 6038598 as applied to claim 1, above, and further in view of Itakura et al., [hereafter Itakura], US Patent No.6351745

34. As to Claim 21, Ambroziak teaches accessing and storing the information [col 2, line 38-45], however, Ambroziak, Danneels do not specifically teach 'comparing means for comparing the effective period with a current time at a predetermined time', 'removal means for removing data in correspondence with the effective period before the current time based upon the result of a comparison'. On the other hand, Itakura disclosed 'comparing means for comparing the effective period with a current time at a predetermined time' [col 21, line 12], 'removal means for removing data in correspondence with the effective period before the current time based upon the result of a comparison' [col 21, line 34-41].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Itakura et al., into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak, method of providing one of

a plurality of web pages mapped to a single URL based on condition[s] of Danneels because both they all are directed to accessing information, more specifically Ambroziak is directed to network browsing to receive documents [see Abstract]; Danneels is directed to generating multiple sets of web pages and their associated conditions [see Abstract], while Itakura is directed to communication system for distributing message as advertisement to user of terminal, more specifically communication network for distributing information to users[see Abstract], further it is noted that Itakura, Ambroziak, Danneels teach Internet [see Danneels: fig 1, Ambroziak: fig 1; Itakura: fig 1 and 3] and are from same field of endeavor.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention would have been motivated to combined the references because that would have allowed users of Ambroziak, Danneels system to control which relative combination of individual documents at predetermined time interval, further updating information is automatically transmitted to the user from the list that satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Itakura et al., [col 5, line 30-35], thus improving quality and reliability of the system.

35. As to Claim 22, Itakura disclosed 'predetermined timing is a time when the system accepts no operations by a user' [col 20, line 59-65].

36. As to Claim 23-24, Itakura disclosed 'removal means requests a user to confirm the removal of the data and removes the confirmed data' [col 21, line 56-65].

37. As to Claim 25, Itakura disclosed 'effective period is not specified by the user, said saving means saves the data in correspondence with a non-limited effective period' [col 20, line 52-55].

38. As to Claim 26, 29, 38, Itakura disclosed 'saving means saves the browsed data in a first save mode and saves the URL in place of the browsed data in a second save mode' [col 8, line 8-11, col 10, line 1-7].

39. As to Claim 27, Danneels disclosed 'setting means sets whether or not data linked to the browsed data is to be saved with the browsed data' [fig 1, col 3, line 3-9, col 4, line 16-22].

40. As to Claim 28, Danneels disclosed 'setting means can set to save all the browsed data without any instruction for each of the browsed data by the user' [col 4, line 50-56].

41. As to Claim 30, Itakura disclosed 'setting means can set not to save the browsed data in a URL specified by the user in advance' [col 15, line 24-32].

42. As to Claim 31, mbroziak teaches a system which including 'index extracting means for extracting as an index a specific data from the data train' [fig 1-2, col 2, line 38-42, col 3, line 22-32]. On the other hand, Itakura disclosed 'address of the browsed data in the network on the basis of a predetermined rule' [col 13, line 8-17].

43. As to Claim 32, 37, Itakura disclosed 'specific data is a domain name' [col 19, line 60-64].

44. As to Claim 33, 35, Itakura disclosed 'predetermined rule is a rule for eliminating a parameter, a protocol, an obvious address, and page data from the data train, and extracting a domain name from the rest of the data with referring to a knowledge base of domain names' [col 20, line 6-15].

45. As to Claim 34, Itakura disclosed 'specific data is a name of organization' [col 13, line 13-17].

46. As to Claim 36, Itakura disclosed 'predetermined rule includes a rule for dividing the rest of the data into partial data with a predetermined symbol and determining each of the partial data as an organization name' [col 14, line 20-26].

47. As to Claim 39, Itakura disclosed 'saved data except for an embedded image' [col 9, line 55-60].

48. Claims 40-57, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319, Danneels, US Patent No. 6038598 as applied to claims 1, above, and further in view of Sidana, US Patent No. 6571295

49. As to Claim 40, Ambroziak, Danneels do not disclosed 'editing means for editing the browsed data'. On the other hand, Sidana disclosed 'editing means for editing the browsed data' [col 7, line 25-40].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Sidana into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak, method of providing one of a plurality of web pages mapped to a single URL based on condition[s] of Danneels, because they are directed to accessing information, more specifically Ambroziak is directed to network browsing to receive documents [see Abstract]; Danneels is directed to generating multiple sets of web pages and their associated conditions [see Abstract], while Sidana is directed to web page annotating and processing, more specifically user access document from a particular web address and views documents, further it redirector modifies the documents and returns with various comments such as annotations to the original documents [see Abstract].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to incorporate the teachings of adding various comments to the

documents of Ambroziak, Danneels's conceptual information from the content of the documents because that would have allowed users of Ambroziak, Danneels to retrieve the selected documents with custom information as suggested by Sidana [see col 2, line 53-58] without modifying original documents, and does not require modification of the browser [col 2, line 46-48], thus improving the quality of web page[s] with additional information.

50. As to Claim 41, Sidana disclosed 'editing means includes annotation means for adding an annotation to the browsed data' [col 6, line 18-30, fig 3, fig 7].

51. As to Claim 42, Sidana, disclosed 'annotation means adds an annotation in such a manner that the annotation is distinguishable from the browsed data' [col 6, line 56-67, col 7, 1-2].

52. As to Claim 43, Sidana disclosed 'editing means includes changing means for changing a display form of a designated portion in the browsed data' [col 7, line 25-35, fig 7].

53. As to Claim 44, Sidana disclosed 'extraction means for extracting a predetermined type of data from the browsed data' [col 9, line 52-63]; 'extracted data saving means for saving the extracted data in the database' [col 7, line 8-13].

54. As to Claim 45, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of Claim 44. In addition, Sidana disclosed 'copying operation' [see fig 4, especially Netscape toolbar: copying, deleting, pasting, save, save as are part of menu operations].

55. As to Claim 46, Sidana disclosed 'predetermined type of data includes at least one of an organization name, a person name, an E-mail.....'[see col 10, line 33-36, line 46-50].

56. As to Claim 47-48, Sidana disclosed 'if the data requested to be saved includes data in other URL, said saving means downloads the included data from the other URL' [col 9, line 28-39].

57. As to Claim 49, Sidana disclosed 'selecting an automatic save mode, and in the automatic save mode, said determination means always determines the user requests to save the browsed data without instruction for each of the browsed data' [col 8, line 52-61].

58. As to Claim 50, the limitation of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of Claim 49. In addition Sidana disclosed 'client apparatus transmits a user request to said server apparatus and receives a response to the user request from said server apparatus' [fig 1-2col 4, line 20-24].

59. As to Claim 51, the limitation of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of Claim 50. In addition, both Ambroziak and Sidana teach 'server apparatus acquires data in an internet' [see Ambroziak: fig 1; Sidana: col 4, line 51-53].

60. As to Claim 52-53, Sidana teaches a system which including 'a local database' [fig 1, element 110]; 'a web information storage device for storing web information acquires from an internet' [fig 1, element 130]; 'administration means for administrating data in either of said database, said local database, and said web information storage device' [fig 1]

61. As to Claim 54-56, Sidana teaches a system which including 'database is equipped in a server apparatus, and said data acquisition means, said determination means, said indexing means, and said saving means are equipped in at least one client apparatus connected to said server apparatus' [fig 1, 3, col 3, line 4-9,col 4, line 19-25].

62. As to Claim 57, the limitation of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 3 above. In addition, both Ambroziak and Sidana teach 'browser connected to said server apparatus, each of said browser browses web page in the internet' [see Ambroziak :fig 1, browser corresponds to browse guide; Sidana: fig 1, element 170].

63. Claims 75-77, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319, Danneels, US Patent No. 6038598, Smith et al., [hereafter Smith], US Patent No. 6578078, as applied to claims 1, 60 above, and further in view of Sidana, US Patent No. 6571295

64. As to Claim 75, both Ambroziak, Smith do not teach 'editing the browsed data', although Ambroziak teaches intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer [see Abstract], while Smith teaches preserving referential integrity within web sites [see Abstract, fig 3]. On the other hand, Sidana disclosed 'editing the browsed data' [col 7, line 25-40].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Sidana into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak, method of providing one of a plurality of web pages mapped to a single URL based on condition[s] of Danneels, preserving referential integrity within web sites of Smith et al. because they all are directed to internet related contents, more specifically all are directed to browsing web sites or web pages [see Ambroziak: fig 1, Abstract; Smith: fig 3, Abstract; Sidana: Abstract, fig 1]. Danneels is directed to generating multiple sets of web pages and their associated conditions [see Abstract].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to combine the references because that would have allowed uses of Ambroziak, Smith et al., to edit individual web pages or documents to satisfy his or her requirements, further bringing the advantages of re-director that accesses the modified document and returns the modified document for viewing by other users that including any additional annotations or comments as suggested by Sidana, Abstract, fig 3, fig 7, thus improving the quality and reliability of the web page processing.

65. As to Claim 76, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 75 above. In addition, Sidana disclosed 'adding an annotation to the browsed data, said annotation is distinguishable from the browsed data' [col 6, line 18-30, fig 3, fig 7].

66. As to Claim 77, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 71 above. In addition, Sidana disclosed 'extracting a predetermined type of data from the browsed data' [col 9, line 52-63], 'saving the extracted data in the storage unit' [col 7, line 8-13].

67. As to claim 80, Kraft teaches a system which including 'extracting a data within a predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser' [col 7, line 1-5, line 64-67, col 8, line 18], Kraft teaches extracting URLs along with the summary data for further processing, more specifically summary metadata items being extracted from

various web pages because, search engine database element 210 maintains or stores information or metadata from previously encountered web pages [see col 7, line 1-5], predetermined meta tag from a web page corresponds to metadata from previously encountered web pages as detailed at col 7, line 1-5;

'displaying, when the retrieved web page is displayed in an area, the extracted data in a predetermined filed outside of the area' [col 7, line 41-46, col 11, line 22-38], Kraft teaches web browser, and user interface, more specifically Kraft teaches viewable or browsable form not only receive user query using user interface or browser element 140, but also displaying search results for example as detailed in fig 6A-6C, further more each fig 6A-6C teaches browser window displaying for example window 400 contains domain-specific term of interest to the user, user select specific item and another browser window 402 appears and displays the search results as detailed in fig 6C; predetermined fields are integral part of Kraft's teaching because Kraft specifically teaches extracting not only summary data but also URLs as detailed in col 7, line 64-67; it is also noted that summary data corresponds to summary metadata items from the search result [see col 8, line 34-35]

68. As to claim 81, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 80 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'saving the displayed web page in a storage unit in correspondence with the data displayed in the predetermined field as an index' [col 7, line 15-18, line 22-26], Kraft specifically teaches abstract/indexing engine as detailed in fig 3, element 260,

further indexed data is being stored in a data repository that generates and matches specific user query.

69. As to claim 82, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 80 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'predetermined meta tag is that of a keyword for the web page' [col 8, line 44-62], Kraft specifically teaches keyword detector that detects keywords and creates a URL, keyword pair for each keyword that corresponds to meta tag [see col 8, 50-52].

70. As to claim 83, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 80 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'predetermined meta tag is that of a title for the web page' [col 8, line 33-38].

71. As to claim 84, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 80 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'displaying a list of indices for web pages saved in the storage unit' [col 6, line 19-24, line 53-59, fig 6A-6C]; 'displaying the web page corresponding to the designated index' [see fig 6A-6C].

72. As to claim 85, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 84 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'list of indices is displayed in another area when the retrieved web page is displayed in the area' [col 6, line 53-59, fig 6A-6C].

73. As to claim 86, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 84 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'sorting the list of indices, and displaying the sorted list of indices' [col 11, line 8-13, line 21-27, fig 6].

74. As to claim 87, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 80 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'editing the displayed web page' [col 10, line 22-31].

75. As to claim 88, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 87 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'annotation is added to the displayed web page' [col 1, line 62-67, col 2, line 1-7, cl 7, line 34-39].

76. As to claim 89, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 80 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'sending the displayed web page or a part thereof to a specified destination' [col 6, line 18-23].

77. As to claim 90, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 89 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'sending step is performed using e-mail' [col 5, line 27-32].

78. As to claim 91, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 89 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'displayed web page except for an embedded data is send in said sending step' [col 7, line 28-33].

79. As to claim 92, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 80 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Kraft disclosed 'URL of the displayed web page is saved instead of the web page in said saving step' [col 8, line 50-55].

Response to Arguments

80. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/15/2004 with respect to claims 1-15,18-57,59-79 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:

a) At page18-19, claim 1,59, 60, applicant argues that the amended claims overcome the prior art as disclosed in Ambroziak, for example claim 1, as amended, requires "setting means for setting a condition for web page datasaving means for saving the web page data.....

As to the above argument [a], Claims 1-8,13-15,18-20, 58-71,78-79,93, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319 in view of Danneels, US Patent No. 6038598.

Examiner clearly stated that Ambroziak specifically teaches for example index server, and querying index, as best understood by the examiner, index server acts as storing indexed web page(s) or web data or documents, further Ambroziak also teaches querying index that corresponds to setting specific condition to retrieve corresponding urls from index element 140, and further it is noted that Ambroziak does not specifically teach 'setting means for setting a condition for web page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data', although Ambroziak teaches acquiring web page data that satisfies the condition(s) [see col 8, line 65-67, col 9, line 1-2, line 16-22]. On the

other hand, Danneels disclosed 'setting means for setting a condition for web page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data' [see abstract, fig 1, col 4, line 19-22], Danneels specifically teaches setting specific condition(s) for web pages and web page and their associated conditions stored in memory element 17.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Danneels into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak because both Danneels and Ambroziak are directed to internet browsing, more specifically browsing internet to retrieve web document(s) or web page(s) [see Danneels: Abstract; Ambroziak: Abstract], and both Danneels and Ambroziak querying specific web page(s), displaying using user interface [see Danneels: fig 1; Ambroziak: fig 12-13] and both Danneels and Ambroziak are from same field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Danneels into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak because that would have allowed used of Ambroziak not only set specific condition for specific web page[s] but also allows to logical evaluation of the set conditions, further allowing to access dynamic web pages to a single uniform resource locator as suggested by Danneels [see col 1, line 65-67, col 2, line 1-7], thus improving quality, reliability of browsing of dynamic world wide web pages.

Examiner applies above arguments to the dependent claims as stated above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- a. US Patent No. 6415319
- b. US Patent No. 6578078
- c. US Patent No. 6571295
- d. US Patent No. 6351745
- e. US Patent No. 6038598

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

- f. US Patent No. 6366956
- g. US Patent No. 5974409
- h. US Patent No. 6070159
- i. US Patent No. 6182063
- j. US Patent No. 5678041
- k. US Patent No. 6505196
- l. US Patent No. 6654749
- m. US Patent No. 5900005

81. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popvici, can be reached on 571-272-4083. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 703/872-9306

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc 
Patent Examiner.
November 17, 2004.

SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER